

#16
B. Webb
5/31/01

PATENT

Customer Number 22,852

Attorney Docket No. 1147-0142

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

FEB 01 2001

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

In re Reissue Application of:)

U.S. Patent No. 5,750,338)

Mark L. Collins et al.)

Group Art Unit: 1655

Reissue Serial No.: 09/533,906)

Examiner: D. Johannsen

Reissue Application Filed: March 8, 2000)

For: TARGET AND BACKGROUND
CAPTURE METHODS WITH
AMPLIFICATION FOR AFFINITY
ASSAYS)



REISSUE LITIGATION BOX

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

NOTICE OF RELATED LITIGATION

Further to the submission of August 7, 2000, the Patent Owner forwards papers relating to Gen-Probe's motion to file an amended complaint to assert inequitable conduct and other defenses.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Statement, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Date: January 31, 2001

By: Jean Burke Fordis
Jean Burke Fordis
Reg. No. 32,984

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

No. 99CV2668 H (AJB)

003029-0055560

1 Amended Complaint, the proposed form of which is attached as Exhibit 7 to the accompanying
2 Declaration of Stephen P. Swinton.

3 By its proposed Second Amended Complaint, Gen-Probe seeks to add new counts for
4 unenforceability due to inequitable conduct and prosecution laches. Gen-Probe has recently
5 confirmed the facts that support these claims. Gen-Probe's motion is timely and made in good
6 faith. Moreover, the proposed amendments will not cause Vysis to suffer prejudice and are not
7 futile.

8 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying
9 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Stephen P. Swinton, the Notice of
10 Lodgment, and on such other and further oral and documentary evidence as the Court may
11 consider at the time of the hearing.

12 Dated: January 19, 2001

13 STEPHEN P. SWINTON
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

14 DOUGLAS E. OLSON
BROBECK PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP

15 R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR.
16 GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED


17 By: 
18 Stephen P. Swinton

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED

No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

FEB 01 2001

TECH CENTER 1600/2900



I. INTRODUCTION.

Plaintiff Gen-Probe, Inc. ("Gen-Probe") seeks leave to file a Second Amended Complaint. This motion is brought in good faith, based on facts recently learned or confirmed by Gen-Probe through discovery. Given the substantial amount of time remaining for fact discovery, expert discovery and trial, Defendant Vysis, Inc. ("Vysis") will not be prejudiced by the amendment. Gen-Probe, therefore, respectfully requests that this Court grant leave to amend its complaint.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS.

Gen-Probe is a local San Diego biotechnology company. Vysis is a successor in interest to Amoco Technology Company and is the owner of United States Patent No. 5,750,338 (the "'338 Patent").

This action concerns the validity and non-infringement of the '338 patent. Through the operative complaint, Gen-Probe seeks a judicial declaration that the '338 patent is not valid, or, in the alternative, a judicial declaration that its NAT test kits for detecting HIV and HCV do not infringe that patent. Declaration of Stephen P. Swinton ("Swinton Decl."), Ex. 1. Gen-Probe also seeks a declaration that Gen-Probe is not obligated to make royalty payments to Vysis pursuant to a license under the '338 patent, and for violations of the California Unfair Business Practices Act, California Business and Professions Code §17200 *et. seq. Id.*

A. Procedural History.

Gen-Probe filed its complaint for declaratory relief on December 22, 1999 (Swinton Decl., ¶ 2). Thereafter, on January 26, 2000, Gen-Probe amended the complaint to add its claim for unfair competition. *Id.*, ¶ 2 and Ex. 1.

Following that amendment, and notwithstanding its prior statements to Gen-Probe that Vysis was satisfied with the claims of the '338 patent, Vysis filed a request for reissue of the '338 on the admitted grounds that the patent was "defective" *Id.* at ¶ 5. On the basis of that reissue proceeding, Vysis then moved the Court to stay the action so that it could cure those defects. *Id.* at ¶ 6. This Court denied that motion on April 28, 2000. *Id.* at ¶ 9.

Gen-Probe actively commenced discovery following the Court's denial of Vysis' motion to

005599-005229

1 stay the case. *Id.* at ¶ 10.¹ Gen-Probe sought documents and interrogatory responses from Vysis
2 and several third parties and provided its own responses to Vysis' discovery in June 2000. *Id.* at
3 ¶¶ 13, 14. Many of the inequitable conduct claims set forth in this amended complaint were first
4 presented to Vysis through that discovery. *Id.*, ¶¶ 11, 13 and Ex. 4.

5 Magistrate Judge Bataglia conducted a Case Management Conference for this matter on
6 September 13, 2000. Swinton Decl., Ex. 5. The Court then issued a scheduling order on
7 September 14, 2000. *Id.* That order provides the following relevant dates:

9	Close of fact discovery	April 17, 2001
10	Initial exchange of expert reports	April 23, 2001
11	Close of expert discovery	June 15, 2001
12	Last day to hear pretrial motions	August 6, 2001
13	Pretrial conference	October 8, 2001.

14 *Id.*

15 As indicated above, substantial time remains for discovery and trial of this action.

16 **B. The Proposed Amendment.**

17 By the proposed amendment, Gen-Probe seeks to confirm in its pleading what it
18 previously substantially disclosed to Vysis in discovery. To begin with, the operative complaint
19 consists of four counts. Swinton Decl., Ex. 1. In the proposed amended pleading, Gen-Probe has
20 not altered or amended any of the allegations existing in that amended complaint. Rather, the
21 proposed complaint adds new matter beginning at page 8.

22 Despite the additional detail set forth in the proposed Second Amended Complaint, the
23 proposed amendment presents factual allegations for just two new claims for relief for
24 unenforceability of the '338 patent. *Id.* Count Five asserts various factual allegations establishing
25 certain acts of Vysis or its predecessors in interest during the prosecution of the '338 patent that
26

27 ¹ Although the parties initially exchanged written discovery in February and March 2000, they
28 agreed to stay activity on that discovery during the pendency of the Court's ruling on Vysis'
motion to stay. Swinton Decl., ¶¶ 3, 4, 7.

00533966-1370300

1 proof with respect to these four issues, *id.* at 187, but also any effort to claim prejudice requires a
2 substantial showing. *See Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose*, 893 F.2d 1074 (9th Cir.
3 1990).

4 As set forth below, none of these factors supports a denial of Gen-Probe's motion to
5 amend.

6 **1. Gen-Probe's Motion For Leave To Amend Is Timely And Made In**
7 **Good Faith.**

8 Under the circumstances of this case, Gen-Probe has timely moved for leave
9 to amend and has acted in good faith. In particular, in light of the application of Rule 9(b) to
10 claims of inequitable conduct, *see, e.g., Chiron Corp. v. Abbott Laboratories*, 156 F.R.D. 219,
11 221-22 (N.D. Cal. 1994), any perceived delay associated with this amendment is entirely
12 attributable to Gen-Probe's good-faith effort to comply with the specificity requirements
13 necessitated by this heightened pleading requirement and is excusable. *Advanced Cardiovascular*
14 *Systems, Inc. v. SciMed Life Systems, Inc.*, 989 F. Supp. 1237, 1247 (N.D. Cal. 1997).

15 As set forth in the accompanying declaration of Stephen P. Swinton, based solely on the
16 public record of the prosecution of the '338 patent, Gen-Probe initially believed that certain facts
17 might exist that constitute inequitable conduct. Swinton Decl., ¶ 2. However, mindful of the dual
18 requirements of Rules 9(b) and 11, Gen-Probe determined that it was appropriate to ascertain the
19 facts supporting those suspicions through discovery prior to formal pleading. *Id.* at ¶¶ 2, 3, 4, 16.
20 In the meantime, Gen-Probe nonetheless disclosed in its discovery responses many of the facts that
21 suggested that Vysis had engaged in inequitable conduct. *Id.* at ¶¶ 11, 13 and Ex. 4. Thereafter, in
22 late October 2000, Gen-Probe obtained the deposition testimony of the principal attorney who
23 prosecuted the patent applications that resulted in the issuance of the '338 patent and ultimately
24 gained access in mid-November and early December 2000 to approximately 100,000 pages of
25 documents related in substantial part to the issues raised in the proposed amendment. *Id.* at ¶¶ 16-
26 20 and Ex. 6. That process continues today with Vysis' still further production on
27 January 16, 2001 of nearly 20,000 pages of "overlooked" documents relevant to the claimed
28 conception. *Id.* at ¶ 22.

///

00533906 030800

1 In view of the obligations imposed upon Gen-Probe under Rules 9(b) and 11, the facts
2 concerning its efforts to discover and amend its pleadings warrant leave to amend. Indeed, in
3 similar situations, district courts have noted that parties seeking to amend a pleading to include a
4 claim that is subject to the particularity requirements of Rule 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
5 Procedure should be afforded substantial temporal leeway to confirm the facts on which that claim
6 is based before seeking leave to amend. *E.g., Advanced Cardiovascular Systems*, 989 F. Supp. at
7 1247.

8 In *Advanced Cardiovascular Systems*, defendant sought to amend its answer to assert a
9 claim for inequitable conduct two years after the action began. *Id.* at 1247. Although the plaintiff
10 argued that the amendment was untimely, the defendant demonstrated that any delay associated it
11 presentation of the amended answer for inequitable conduct was the result of its efforts to confirm
12 through discovery the underlying facts supporting the defense. In allowing the amendment, the
13 district court noted that, particularly in light of the application of Rule 9(b) to the proposed
14 defense, the defendant was entitled to confirm its contemplated factual allegations before seeking
15 leave to amend. *Id.* at 1247.

16 The district court in *Rhone-Poulenc Agro S.A. v. Monsanto Co.*, 73 F. Supp. 2d 537, 538-
17 539 (M.D.N.C. 1999), reached a similar result. There, the district court allowed the defendant to
18 amend its answer to include an inequitable conduct defense, even though the date by which the
19 parties were to have filed amended pleadings had long since passed. *Id.* In that case, the court
20 concluded that the delay in seeking leave to amend was neither purposely dilatory nor in bad faith,
21 reasoning Monsanto was entitled to await the completion of certain discovery that was expected to
22 provide clarifying information before seeking leave to amend. *Id.* To this end, the *Rhone-Poulenc*
23 Court noted that the appropriate inquiry is not whether the interim discovery revealed facts to
24 support the inequitable conduct allegations, but whether it was reasonable for the party seeking to
25 amend to expect to obtain clarifying information as a result of that discovery. *Id.*

26 As noted above, Gen-Probe earlier *suspected* that Vysis may have engaged in inequitable
27 conduct during the prosecution of the myriad of patent applications that matured into the '338
28

005537906 070600
0090000 995555

1 patent.² But rather than seeking leave to file a pleading containing potentially insufficient or
2 unsubstantiated allegations of inequitable conduct at that time, Gen-Probe chose, in good faith, to
3 await the completion of certain discovery it believed necessary to confirm its suspicions. Swinton
4 Decl., ¶¶ 2, 3, 4, 16. To confirm the factual basis for its inequitable conduct charges, Gen-Probe
5 propounded document requests and subpoenas and took the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Vysis and
6 Amoco on the prosecution of the patent applications that led to the issuance of the '338 patent. *Id.*
7 at ¶¶ 3, 4, 16. During that deposition, Gen-Probe gathered additional facts to support its
8 inequitable conduct allegations. *Id.* at ¶ 18.

9 Gen-Probe did not immediately move for leave to amend following the October 27th
10 deposition of Vysis and Amoco because Vysis had not yet produced the vast majority of the
11 documents responsive to Gen-Probe's document requests. *Id.* at ¶ 19. Gen-Probe believed that
12 these documents would contain additional information necessary to confirm the factual basis for
13 the inequitable conduct allegations. *Id.* Additionally, at that time, Gen-Probe still awaited the
14 production of documents responsive to certain subpoenas that Gen-Probe had propounded to third
15 parties believed to possess documents pertaining to the prosecution of the relevant patent
16 applications. *Id.* Gen-Probe believed that the documents responsive to the subpoenas were also
17 necessary to validate its inequitable conduct theories. *Id.*

18 During mid-November and early December 2000, Vysis produced approximately 100,000
19 pages of documents responsive to Gen-Probe's document requests. Swinton Decl., ¶ 20. Gen-
20 Probe completed a preliminary review of these documents in early January 2001. *Id.* at ¶ 21. On
21 January 16, 2001, Vysis produced another 8 bankers' boxes of responsive documents, which boxes
22 contain nearly 20,000 pages of additional documents. *Id.* at ¶ 22.

23
24
25 ² Gen-Probe first alluded to its inequitable conduct theories in its Memorandum Of Points And
26 Authorities Of Gen-Probe Incorporated In Response To Vysis' Motion: (1) For A Stay Of
27 Proceedings And, Alternatively, (2) To Dismiss Count Four Under Federal Rule Of Civil
28 Procedure 12(b)(6). Swinton Decl., ¶ 8 and Ex. 3. Thereafter, on May 17, 2000, Gen-Probe Vysis
propounded discovery seeking the basis of the inequitable conduct allegations to which Gen-Probe
referred in those papers. *Id.* at ¶ 11. Gen-Probe provided a response to that discovery on
June 20, 2000. *Id.* at ¶ 13 and Ex. 2.

00533900 030800
00000000 00000000

1 In short, Gen-Probe's motion for leave to amend is timely and made in good faith. Rather
2 than rush to file speculative or unsubstantiated claims of inequitable conduct, Gen-Probe exercised
3 good faith and waited until it had gathered and confirmed facts to support its allegations that Vysis
4 had engaged in inequitable conduct in connection with the prosecution of the various patent
5 applications that led to the '338 patent. Gen-Probe should not be criticized for delay or bad faith.

6 **2. Granting Gen-Probe Leave To Amend Will Not Prejudice Vysis.**

7 The further factor of prejudice also does not apply in this instance. In light
8 of the substantial time remaining before the close of fact and expert discovery, Vysis will not be
9 unduly prejudiced by the proposed amendment.

10 To begin with, as noted above, the Ninth Circuit has directed that any prejudice sufficient
11 to deny amendment must be substantial. *DCD Programs*, 833 F.2d at 186. In this case, however,
12 any anticipated argument of prejudice to Vysis cannot rise to that level. In truth, because *all* the
13 evidence concerning Gen-Probe's proposed claims of inequitable conduct and laches is solely
14 within the possession of Vysis already, there exists significant question as to whether any
15 prejudice, whatsoever, will arise.

16 In *Rhone-Poulenc*, for example, the court held the plaintiff would suffer no prejudice if the
17 defendant was allowed to amend its answer to include an inequitable conduct defense, even though
18 the discovery cut-off passed weeks *before* the motion for leave to amend was filed. 73 F. Supp. 2d
19 at 539. The *Rhone-Poulenc* court reasoned that because the inequitable conduct allegations related
20 to the prosecution of the patent-in-suit and because the party seeking to amend had provided an
21 analysis of its inequitable conduct defense, little, if any, additional discovery would be necessary.
22 *Id.*

23 Consistent with the absence of substantial prejudice in the *Rhone-Poulenc* case, Vysis
24 cannot establish prejudice here. To begin with, the factual underpinning for inequitable conduct
25 allegations contained in Gen-Probe's proposed Second Amended Complaint are the acts of Vysis
26 and its predecessors-in-interest. Vysis has access to all the documentary evidence relevant to the
27 prosecution of the various patent applications that led to the '338 patent. In addition, the attorney
28 responsible for prosecuting the relevant patent applications is a current Vysis employee. Swinton

00537906-030800

1 Decl., Ex. 6. Further, as was the case in *Rhone-Poulenc*, Gen-Probe has concurrently provided
2 Vysis with a detailed analysis of its inequitable conduct allegations by way of the amended
3 pleading and discovery.

4 Finally, the likelihood for prejudice is even less, here, than it was in *Rhone-Poulenc*,
5 because, here, the discovery cut-off has not yet passed. Given that discovery does not close until
6 April 17, 2001 and that Vysis has yet to conduct a single deposition, *id.* at ¶ 24, there is more than
7 sufficient time for Vysis to conduct discovery into and respond fully to these amendments. In
8 sum, Vysis will not suffer any prejudice if Gen-Probe is granted leave to amend.

9 **3. Gen-Probe's proposed amendment is not futile.**

10 The final factor of "futility" also supports Gen-Probe's proposed
11 amendments. An amendment is "futile" only if it merely reasserts a claim on which the court
12 previously ruled, fails to state a legal theory, or could not withstand a motion to dismiss. *Bowery*
13 *v. Jones*, 978 F.2d 1004, 1008 (7th Cir. 1982); *see, e.g., Doe v. United States*, 58 F.3d 494, 497
14 (9th Cir. 1995). The proposed pleading states *prima facie* claims of unenforceability due to
15 inequitable conduct and laches, neither of which have yet been presented to this Court.

16 As to its claim for inequitable conduct, Gen-Probe has plead each of the essential elements
17 of inequitable conduct: "(1) prior art or information that is material; (2) knowledge chargeable to
18 applicant of that prior art or information and of its materiality; and (3) failure of the applicant to
19 disclose the art or information resulting from an intent to mislead the PTO." *FMC Co. v.*
20 *Manitowoc Co.*, 835 F.2d 1411, 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Each of Gen-Probe's identified acts of
21 inequitable conduct set forth these essential elements.

22 Gen-Probe's allegations also satisfy the particularity requirements of Rule 9(b). In
23 particular, Gen-Probe has identified "the circumstances constituting fraud . . . so that the defendant
24 can prepare an adequate answer from its allegations." *Moore v. Kayport Package Express, Inc.*,
25 885 F.2d 531, 540 (9th Cir. 1989). Throughout its unenforceability count, Gen-Probe describes
26 each of Vysis' misrepresentations to the Patent Office by specifying dates on which they occurred,
27 the content thereof, and how those misrepresentations were false and misleading.

28 ///

0053706.030800

1 With respect to Gen-Probe's claim for unenforceability due to laches in the prosecution of
2 the '338 patent, Gen-Probe has modeled that claim in light of arguments currently before the Court
3 of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in the matter entitled *Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Lemelson*
4 *Medical, Education & Research Foundation, Limited Partnership*, 2000 WL 1300430 (Fed. Civ.
5 Sept. 1, 2000) (Notice of Lodgment, Ex. 1). In that case, the defendant contends that Lemelson
6 unduly delayed the prosecution of the patents-in-suit by abusing the continuation application
7 process. *Id.* Although the district court in that matter dismissed that defense of "prosecution
8 laches" under Rule 12(b)(6), the district court certified its order, finding that the claim involved a
9 controlling question of law as to which there was a substantial ground for difference of opinion.
10 *Id.* at *2. The Federal Circuit accepted the matter for interlocutory review. *Id.* The district court's
11 certification of the legitimacy of the issue and the Federal Circuit's acceptance of that matter for
12 rare, interlocutory review suggests that the defense is viable and applicable to the stated facts
13 surrounding Vysis extraordinary 12-year odyssey of self-imposed and manipulated delays in the
14 Patent Office.

15 **IV. CONCLUSION.**


16 For the foregoing reasons, Gen-Probe respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion
17 for leave to file its Second Amended Complaint.

18 Dated: January 19, 2001

19 STEPHEN P. SWINTON
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

20 DOUGLAS E. OLSON
BROBECK PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP

21 R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR.
22 GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED

23 By: 
24 Stephen P. Swinton

25 Attorneys for Plaintiff
26 Gen-Probe Incorporated
27
28

00333506-03000

1 STEPHEN P. SWINTON (106398)
COOLEY GODWARD LLP
2 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92121-2128
3 Telephone: (858) 550-6000
Facsimile: (858) 453-3555
4
5 DOUGLAS E. OLSON (38649)
BROBECK PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP
12390 El Camino Real
6 San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 720-2500
7 Facsimile: (858) 720-2555
8
9 R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR. (102178)
GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED
10210 Genetic Center Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-4362
10 Telephone: (858) 410-8918
Facsimile: (858) 410-8637
11
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED

RECEIVED

FEB 01 2001

TECH CENTER 1600/2900



13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15

16 GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED,
17 Plaintiff,
18 v.
19 VYSIS, INC.,
20 Defendant.
21

No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

DECLARATION OF STEPHEN P. SWINTON IN
SUPPORT OF GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT

Date: February 20, 2001
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept.: Courtroom 1

22 I, Stephen P. Swinton, declare as follows:

23 1. I am an attorney at law, licensed to practice before the Courts of the State of
24 California and admitted to practice before this Court. I am a partner in the law firm Cooley
25 Godward LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiff Gen-Probe Incorporated ("Gen-Probe"). I am lead
26 trial counsel for Gen-Probe, and I have been substantially involved in the preparation of this matter
27 for trial. If called as a witness in this matter, I could and would competently testify to the matters
28 set forth below:

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO

265759 v1/SD
5P2701!.DOC
011901/1432

No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)

003050-996550

2. Gen-Probe filed the initial Complaint in this action on December 22, 1999. On January 26, 2000, before Vysis responded to that pleading, Gen-Probe filed its First Amended Complaint. Although Gen-Probe suspected that there existed a factual basis to allege a cause of action for inequitable conduct at this time, Gen-Probe was not then in possession of sufficient facts to plead such a cause of action with the required particularity. A true and correct copy of the First Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

3. On February 3, 2000, Gen-Probe propounded to Vysis Gen-Probe's First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Vysis, Inc. ("Document Requests"), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 2. When Gen-Probe propounded these document requests, it believed that the requests might unearth documents necessary to confirm that Vysis engaged in inequitable conduct before the patent office.

4. On March 8, 2000, Gen-Probe propounded document subpoenas (the "Subpoenas") to BP Amoco, Thomas Banks, Norval Galloway, and Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett and Dunner LLP ("Finnegan, Henderson") (collectively the "Third Party Witnesses"). For the most part, the categories of documents sought by the subpoenas were identical the categories of documents sought by Gen-Probe's Document Requests to Vysis. Gen-Probe believed that the Third Party Witnesses possessed documents relevant to the prosecution of United States Patent No. 5,750,338 (the "'338 patent"), which is the patent-in-suit.

5. On March 8, 2000, notwithstanding its prior statements to Gen-Probe that Vysis was satisfied with the claims of the '338 patent, Vysis filed a request for reissue of the '338 on the admitted grounds that the patent was "defective."

6. On March 9, 2000, Vysis filed a motion encaptioned Motion by Vysis, Inc. For A Stay Of Proceedings And, Alternatively, To Dismiss Count Four Of The First Amended Complaint Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure § 12(b)(6) ("Motion to Stay"), where Vysis asserted that the litigation should be stayed pending the conclusion of the reissue proceeding that Vysis had initiated the day prior.

7. In or about March 2000, the parties stipulated to suspend temporarily their discovery efforts, pending the resolution of the Motion to Stay.

003006-030800

1 depositions were to be held in late October 2000. Gen-Probe believed that the information it
2 would gather during these depositions would help to confirm its suspicions that Vysis had engaged
3 in inequitable conduct with respect to the '338 patent.

4 17. Several days in advance of the Rule 30(b)(6) Patent Prosecution Depositions, per
5 Gen-Probe's request, Vysis produced to Gen-Probe files it had maintained with respect to the
6 prosecution of several patent applications related to the '338 patent.

7 18. On October 26 and 27, 2001, Gen-Probe deposed Vysis and BP Amoco's 30(b)(6)
8 designee on the prosecution of the '338 patent, Norval Galloway. During the Rule 30(b)(6) Patent
9 Prosecution Depositions, Gen-Probe for the first time learned certain facts contained in the
10 [Proposed] Second Amended Complaint, and confirmed other facts contained therein.

11 19. Although Gen-Probe learned additional facts to support its allegations of
12 inequitable conduct during the Rule 30(b)(6) Patent Prosecution Depositions, Gen-Probe
13 determined that it would be appropriate to defer seeking leave to amend until after Vysis produced
14 all of the documents responsive to the Document Requests and the Third Party Witnesses produced
15 all of the documents responsive to the Subpoenas.

16 20. In mid-November and early December 2000, Vysis produced to Gen-Probe
17 approximately 100,000 pages of documents.

18 21. Gen-Probe immediately undertook to review these documents and completed its
19 initial review of those documents in early January 2001.

20 22. On January 16, 2001, Vysis produced an additional eight banker's boxes of
21 documents, which boxes contain approximately 20,000 additional pages of responsive documents.

22 23. Vysis has not yet noticed or taken any depositions in this matter.


23 24. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of the Scheduling Order
24 issued in this matter.

25 25. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of a Declaration Norval
26 Galloway, which Vysis filed earlier in this case, wherein Mr. Galloway states that he is Vysis'
27 primary in-house patent prosecution attorney and that he possesses detailed knowledge about the
28 patent-in-suit.

99cv2668-03060

1 26. Attached as Exhibit 7 to this Declaration is the original copy of Gen-Probe's
2 [Proposed] Second Amended Complaint.

3 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true
4 and correct and that I executed this declaration in San Diego, California on January 19, 2001.

5
6
7 
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28